arXiv:gr-qc/9612052v1 18 Dec 1996

Solutions to a Quantal Gravity-Matter Field Theory on a Line

Roman Jackiw*

Dedicated to Tullio Regge on his sixty-fifth birthday

2nd Conference on Constrained Dynamics and Quantum Gravity
Santa Margherita, Italy, September 1996

Abstract. Solutions to a scalar-tensor (dilaton) quantum gravity theory, interacting with quantized matter, are described. Dirac quantization is frustrated by quantal anomalies in the constraint algebra. Progress is made only after the Wheeler–DeWitt equation is modified by quantal terms, which eliminate the anomaly. More than one modification is possible, resulting in more than one 'physical' spectrum in the quantum theory, corresponding to the given classical model.

I. INTRODUCTION

Constructing the quantum version of classical gravity theory remains a challenge for theoretical physics, because Einstein's theory resists quantization for a variety of reasons. The principal obstacle is its non-renormalizability, and this prevents meaningful calculation of quantal processes. Additionally, there are conceptual difficulties that are peculiar to diffeomorphism-invariant quantum theories. These include the question of how to introduce time into the theory, the interpretational issues that arise from the unfamiliar role of the Hamiltonian as a constraint, and the puzzles of unitary evolution in presence of classical singularities (black holes). Very little illumination can be gotten on these topics, when explicit calculation is frustrated by infinities.

One response to the impasse of quantum gravity is to look at models in dimensions lower than the physical (3+1). In the lower-dimensional worlds there are no propagating gravitons, and no associated infinities. But the conceptual questions surrounding a diffeomorphism-invariant quantum theory remain. Tullio Regge, to whom this essay is dedicated on his sixty-fifth birthday, has actively advanced the subject of (2+1)-dimensional gravity by exploring its mathematical, specifically its algebraic, structures. This model has the added attraction that it is physically relevant as a description of processes that are kinematically restricted to move on a plane in the presence of cosmic strings. Also it gives a realization to the Regge link-calculus for geometry.

I shall describe some research carried out with colleagues on still lower dimensional gravity – gravity on a line or *lineal* gravity, *i.e.*, in (1+1) dimensions.

The approach that I take is to view gravity as a gauge theory. But when I speak of gravity theory as a 'gauge theory', I mean only that the symmetry transformations, which leave the model invariant, depend on parameters that are arbitrary functions of space-time, as is clearly the case with invariance against arbitrary coordinate redefinition. I do not necessarily imply that gravity theory can be formulated as a vectorial gauge theory.

*This work is supported in part by funds provided by the U.S. Department of Energy under contract #DE-FC02-94ER40818. MIT-CTP-2598

In fact, for lower-dimensional gravity it is frequently possible to formulate the model as a vectorial gauge theory, based on a finite-dimensional Lie group, but with kinematics not following the Yang–Mills paradigm; rather, other – non-Yang–Mills – kinetic terms, available in these lower dimensions, are employed: Chern–Simons term in (2+1) dimensions, B–F expression in (1+1) dimensions.

However, in my presentation here I shall not delve into such specifically gauge-theoretic formulations of gravity theory, but I shall organize my presentation around the theme common to all gauge theories: the existence of constraints in a canonical (symplectic) formulation, and the possible emergence of quantal obstructions – anomalies – in the quantum algebra of constraints. My hope is that the experience gained in the last quarter-century with vectorial gauge theories will enable us to go far in the analysis of the gravitational model.

II. VECTOR GAUGE THEORIES

In a canonical, Hamiltonian approach to quantizing a theory with local symmetry – a theory that is invariant against transformations whose parameters are arbitrary functions on space-time – there occur constraints, which are imposed on physical states. Typically these constraints correspond to time components of the Euler–Lagrange equations, and vectorial gauge theories provide familiar examples. The time component of a Yang–Mills gauge field equation is the Gauss law:

$$G_a \equiv \mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{E}^a - \rho^a = 0 \quad . \tag{1}$$

Here $\mathbf{E}^a$ is the (non-Abelian) electric field, ρ^a the matter charge density, and $\mathbf{D}$ denotes the gauge-covariant derivative. When expressed in terms of canonical variables, G_a does *not* involve time-derivatives – it depends on canonical coordinates and momenta, which we denote collectively by the symbols X and P, respectively (X and P are fields defined at fixed time): $G_a = G_a(X, P)$. Thus in a Schrödinger representation for the theory, the Gauss law condition on physical states

$$G_a(X, P)|\,\psi\,\rangle = 0 \tag{2}$$

corresponds to a (functional) differential equation that the state functional $\Psi(X)$ must satisfy:

$$G_a\left(X, \frac{1}{i}\frac{\delta}{\delta X}\right)\,\Psi(X) = 0 \quad . \tag{3}$$

In fact, Eq. (3) represents an infinite number of equations, one for each spatial point $\mathbf{r}$, since G_a is also the generator of the local symmetry: $G_a = G_a(\mathbf{r})$. Consequently, questions of consistency (integrability) arise, and these may be examined by considering the commutator of two constraints. Precisely because the G_a generate the symmetry transformation, one expects their commutator to follow the Lie algebra with structure constants f_{abc}:

$$[G_a(\mathbf{r}), G_b(\tilde{\mathbf{r}})] = i\, f_{abc}\, G_c(\mathbf{r})\, \delta(\mathbf{r} - \tilde{\mathbf{r}}) \quad . \tag{4}$$

If (4) holds, the constraints are consistent – they are first-class – and the constraint equations (3) are integrable, at least locally.

However, it is by now well known that Eq. (4), which *does* hold classically with Poisson bracketing, may acquire a quantal anomaly. Indeed, when the matter charge density is constructed from fermions of a definite chirality, the Gauss law algebra is modified by an extension – a Schwinger term – the constraint equations become second-class and Eq. (3) is inconsistent and cannot be solved. We call such gauge theories 'anomalous'.

This does not mean that a quantum theory cannot be constructed from an anomalous gauge theory. One can adopt various strategies for overcoming the obstruction, but these represent modifications of the original model. Moreover, the resulting quantum theory possesses physical content that can be far removed from what one might infer by studying the classical model. All this is explicitly illustrated by the anomalous chiral Schwinger model, whose Gauss law is obstructed, while a successful construction of the quantum theory leads to massive excitations, which cannot be anticipated from the unquantized equations [1].

III. GRAVITY THEORIES

With these facts in mind, we turn now to gravity theory, which obviously is invariant against local transformations that redefine coordinates of space-time. It is found that here too the time components of Einstein's equation again comprise the constraints in a canonical formulation of dynamics:

$$\frac{1}{8\pi G}\left(R_\nu^0 - \tfrac{1}{2}\delta_\nu^0 R\right) - T_\nu^0 = 0 \quad . \tag{5}$$

The gravitational part is the time component of the Einstein tensor $R_\nu^\mu - \frac{1}{2}\delta_\nu^\mu R$; weighted by Newton's constant G, this equals the time component of the matter energy-momentum tensor, T_ν^μ. In the quantized theory, the collection of canonical operators on the left side in (5) should annihilate physical states. The resulting equations may be presented as

$$\mathcal{E}\,|\psi\rangle = 0 \tag{6}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_i\,|\psi\rangle = 0 \tag{7}$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ is the energy constraint [the $\nu = 0$ component of (5)], composed of its gravity and matter parts

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^{\,\mathrm{gravity}} + \mathcal{E}^{\,\mathrm{matter}} \tag{8}$$

and $\mathcal{P}_i$ is the momentum constraint [the $\nu = i$ component of (5)], also with gravity and matter parts:

$$\mathcal{P}_i = \mathcal{P}_i^{\mathrm{gravity}} + \mathcal{P}_i^{\mathrm{matter}} \quad . \tag{9}$$

Taking for definiteness matter to be described by a massless, spinless field φ, with canonical momentum Π, we have

$$\mathcal{E}^{\,\mathrm{matter}} = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(\Pi^2 + \gamma\,\gamma^{ij}\,\partial_i\varphi\,\partial_j\varphi\right) \tag{10}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_i^{\mathrm{matter}} = \partial_i\varphi\,\Pi \quad . \tag{11}$$

Here γ_{ij} is the spatial metric tensor; γ its determinant; γ^{ij} its inverse.

The momentum constraint in Eq. (7) is easy to unravel. In a Schrödinger representation, it requires that $\Psi(\gamma_{ij}, \varphi)$ be a functional of the canonical field variables γ_{ij}, φ that is invariant against reparameterization of the spatial coordinates, and such functionals are easy to construct.

Of course it is (6), the Wheeler–DeWitt equation, that is highly nontrivial, and once again one asks about its consistency. If the commutators of $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ follow their Poisson brackets one would expect that the following algebra holds:

$$[\mathcal{P}_i(\mathbf{r}), \mathcal{P}_j(\tilde{\mathbf{r}})] = i\mathcal{P}_j(\mathbf{r})\,\partial_i\,\delta(\mathbf{r}-\tilde{\mathbf{r}}) + i\mathcal{P}_i(\tilde{\mathbf{r}})\,\partial_j\,\delta(\mathbf{r}-\tilde{\mathbf{r}}) \tag{12}$$

$$[\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{r}), \mathcal{E}(\tilde{\mathbf{r}})] = i\Big(\mathcal{P}^i(\mathbf{r}) + \mathcal{P}^i(\tilde{\mathbf{r}})\Big)\partial_i\,\delta(\mathbf{r}-\tilde{\mathbf{r}}) \tag{13}$$

$$[\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{r}), \mathcal{P}_i(\tilde{\mathbf{r}})] = i\Big(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{r}) + \mathcal{E}(\tilde{\mathbf{r}})\Big)\partial_i\,\delta(\mathbf{r}-\tilde{\mathbf{r}}) \quad . \tag{14}$$

Here $\mathcal{P}^i \equiv \gamma\,\gamma^{ij}\,\mathcal{P}_j$. If true, Eqs. (12)–(14) would demonstrate the consistency of the constraints, since they appear first-class. In fact, since we have already described the solution to the momentum constraint (7), we expect that (12) is not modified by quantal corrections. It remains to examine (13)–(14). Unfortunately, establishing (13)–(14) in the quantized theory is highly problematical. First of all there is the issue of operator ordering in the gravitational portion of $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{P}$. Much has been said about this, and I shall not address that difficulty here.

The problem that I want to call attention to is the very likely occurrence of an extension in the $[\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P}_i]$ commutator (14). We know that in flat space, the commutator between the matter energy and momentum densities possesses a noncanonical triple derivative Schwinger term [2]. There does not appear any known mechanism arising from the gravity variables that would effect a cancellation of this obstruction.

A definite resolution of this question in the full quantum theory is out of reach at the present time. Non-canonical Schwinger terms can be determined only after a clear understanding of the singularities in the quantum field theory and the nature of its Hilbert space are in hand, and this is obviously lacking for four-dimensional quantum gravity.

Faced with the impasse, we turn to a gravitational model in two-dimensional space-time – a *lineal* gravity theory – where the calculation can be carried to a definite conclusion: an obstruction does exist and the model is anomalous. Various mechanisms are available to overcome the anomaly, but the resulting various quantum theories are inequivalent.

In two dimensions, Einstein's equation is vacuous because $R^\mu_\nu = \frac{1}{2}\delta^\mu_\nu R$; therefore, gravitational dynamics has to be invented afresh. The models that have been studied recently posit local dynamics for the 'gravity' sector, which involves as variables the metric tensor and an additional world scalar ('dilaton' or Lagrange multiplier) field. Such 'scalar-tensor' theories, introduced a decade ago [3], are obtained by dimensional reduction from higher-dimensional Einstein theory [3,4]. They should be contrasted with models where quantum fluctuations of matter variables induce gravitational dynamics [5], which therefore are nonlocal and do not appear to offer any insight into the questions posed by the physical, four-dimensional theory.

The model we study is the so-called 'string-inspired dilaton gravity' – CGHS theory [6]. The gravitational action involves the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$, the dilaton field ϕ, and a cosmological constant λ. The matter action describes the coupling of a massless, spinless field φ:

$$I_{\rm gravity} = \int \mathrm{d}^2x\,\sqrt{-g}\,e^{-2\phi}\,(R + 4g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\phi\,\partial_\nu\phi - \lambda) \tag{15}$$

$$I_{\rm matter} = \tfrac{1}{2}\int \mathrm{d}^2x\,\sqrt{-g}\,g^{\mu\nu}\,\partial_\mu\varphi\,\partial_\nu\varphi \quad . \tag{16}$$

The total action is the sum of (15) and (16), weighted by 'Newton's' constant G:

$$I = \frac{1}{4\pi G}\, I_{\rm gravity} + I_{\rm matter} \quad . \tag{17}$$

In fact this theory can be given a gauge-theoretical 'B–F' description based on the centrally extended Poincaré group in (1+1) dimensions [7]. This formulation aided us immeasurably in the subsequent analysis/transformations. However, I shall not discuss this here, because in retrospect it proved possible to carry the analysis forward within the metric formulation (15)–(17).

After a remarkable sequence of redefinitions and canonical transformations on the dynamical variables in (15)–(17), one can present I in terms of a first-order Lagrange density $\mathcal{L}$ that is a sum of terms, quadratic in the dynamical variables [7]:

$$\mathcal{L} = \pi_a \dot{r}^a + \Pi\dot{\varphi} - \alpha\mathcal{E} - \beta\mathcal{P} \tag{18}$$

$$\mathcal{E} = -\tfrac{1}{2}\left(\tfrac{1}{\Lambda}\pi^a\pi_a + \Lambda r^{a\prime} r_a{}'\right) + \tfrac{1}{2}\left(\Pi^2 + \varphi'^2\right) \tag{19}$$

$$\mathcal{P} = -r^{a\prime}\pi_a - \varphi'\Pi \quad . \tag{20}$$

I shall not derive this, but merely explain it. The index a runs over flat two-dimensional (t,σ) space, with signature $(1,-1)$. Dots (dashes) signify differentiation with respect to time t (space σ). The four variables $\{r^a,\alpha,\beta\}$ correspond to the four gravitational variables $(g_{\mu\nu},\phi)$, where only r^a is dynamical with canonically conjugate momentum π_a, while α and β act as Lagrange multipliers. Notice that regardless of the sign $\Lambda \equiv \lambda/8\pi G$, the gravitational contribution to $\mathcal{E}$, is quadratic with indefinite sign:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}^{\,\rm gravity} &= -\tfrac{1}{2}\left(\tfrac{1}{\Lambda}\pi^a\pi_a + \Lambda r^{a\prime} r_a{}'\right) \\
&= -\tfrac{1}{2\Lambda}(\pi_0)^2 + \tfrac{1}{2\Lambda}(\pi_1)^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\Lambda(r^{0\prime})^2 + \tfrac{1}{2}\Lambda(r^{1\prime})^2 \\
&= -\mathcal{E}_0 + \mathcal{E}_1 \qquad (21)\\
\mathcal{E}_0 &= \tfrac{1}{2}\left(\tfrac{1}{\Lambda}(\pi_0)^2 + \Lambda(r^{0\prime})^2\right) \qquad (22)\\
\mathcal{E}_1 &= \tfrac{1}{2}\left(\tfrac{1}{\Lambda}(\pi_1)^2 + \Lambda(r^{1\prime})^2\right) \quad . \qquad (23)
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the gravitational contribution to the momentum does not show alteration of sign:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}^{\,\rm gravity} &= -r^{a\prime}\pi_a \\
&= -r^{0\prime}\pi_0 - r^{1\prime}\pi_1 \\
&= \mathcal{P}_0 + \mathcal{P}_1 \qquad (24)\\
\mathcal{P}_0 &= -r^{0\prime}\pi_0 \qquad (25)\\
\mathcal{P}_1 &= -r^{1\prime}\pi_1 \quad . \qquad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

All our results, and the variety of ways that they can be obtained, are a consequence of the sign variation between the '0' and '1' contributions to $\mathcal{E}^{\rm gravity}$. One may understand the relative negative sign between the two gravitational contributors $(a = 0, 1)$ as follows. Pure metric gravity in two space-time dimensions is described by three functions collected in $g_{\mu\nu}$. Diffeomorphism invariance involves 2 functions, which reduce the number of variables by 2×2, *i.e.*, pure gravity has $3 - 4 = -1$ degrees of freedom. Adding the dilaton ϕ gives a net number of $-1 + 1 = 0$, as in our final gravitational Lagrangian.

The matter contribution is the conventional expression for massless and spinless fields:

$$\mathcal{E}^{\,\mathrm{matter}} = \tfrac{1}{2}(\Pi^2 + \varphi'^2) \tag{27}$$

$$\mathcal{P}^{\,\mathrm{matter}} = -\varphi'\,\Pi \quad . \tag{28}$$

With the formulation in Eqs. (18)–(28) of the theory (15)–(17) we embark upon the various quantization procedures.

The transformed theory appears very simple: there are three independent dynamical fields $\{r^a, \varphi\}$ and together with the canonical momenta $\{\pi_a, \Pi\}$ they are governed by a quadratic Hamiltonian, which has no interaction terms among the three. Similarly, the momentum comprises noninteracting terms. However, there remains a subtle 'correlation interaction' as a consequence of the constraint that $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ annihilate physical states, as follows from varying the Lagrange multipliers α and β in (18)

$$\mathcal{E}\,|\psi\rangle \;= 0 \tag{29}$$

$$\mathcal{P}\,|\psi\rangle \;= 0 \quad . \tag{30}$$

Thus, even though $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ each are sums of noninteracting variables, the physical states $|\psi\rangle$ are *not* direct products of states for the separate degrees of freedom. Note that Eqs. (29) and (30) comprise the entire physical content of the theory. There is no need for any further 'gauge-fixing' or 'ghost' variables – this is the advantage of the Hamiltonian formalism.

As in four dimensions, the momentum constraint (30) enforces invariance of the state functional $\Psi(r^a, \varphi)$ against spatial coordinate transformations, while the energy constraint (29) – the Wheeler–DeWitt equation in the present lineal gravity context – is highly nontrivial.

Once again one looks to the algebra of the constraints to check consistency. The reduction of (12)–(14) to one spatial dimension leaves (after the identification $\mathcal{P}_i \to -\mathcal{P}, \gamma\gamma^{ij} \to 1$)

$$i[\mathcal{P}(\sigma), \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\sigma})] = \big(\mathcal{P}(\sigma) + \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\sigma})\big)\,\delta'(\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}) \tag{31}$$

$$i[\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\tilde{\sigma})] = \big(\mathcal{P}(\sigma) + \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\sigma})\big)\,\delta'(\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}) \tag{32}$$

$$i[\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\sigma})] = \big(\mathcal{E}(\sigma) + \mathcal{E}(\tilde{\sigma})\big)\,\delta'(\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}) - \frac{c}{12\pi}\delta'''(\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}) \tag{33}$$

where we have allowed for a possible central extension of strength c, and it remains to calculate this quantity.

The gained advantage in two-dimensional space-time is that all operators are quadratic [see (21)–(28)]; the singularity structure may be assessed and c computed; obviously it is composed of independent contributions:

$$c = c^{\,\mathrm{gravity}} + c^{\,\mathrm{matter}} \qquad c^{\,\mathrm{gravity}} = c_0 + c_1 \quad . \tag{34}$$

Surprisingly, however, there is more than one way of handling infinities and more than one answer for c can be gotten. This reflects the fact, already known to Jordan in the 1930s [8], that an anomalous Schwinger term depends on how the vacuum is defined.

In the present context, there is no argument about $c^{\,\mathrm{matter}}$; the answer is

$$c^{\,\mathrm{matter}} = 1 \quad . \tag{35}$$

The same holds for the positively signed gravity variable (assume $\Lambda > 0$, so that r^1 enters positively):

$$c_1 = 1 \quad . \tag{36}$$

But the negatively signed gravitational variable can be treated in more than one way, giving different answers for c_0. The different approaches may be named 'Schrödinger representation quantum field theory' and 'BRST string/conformal field theory', and the variety arises owing to the various ways one can quantize a theory with a negative kinetic term, like the r^0 gravitational variable.

Explicitly, the variety may be brought out by the following calculation. Since we are dealing with quadratic expressions, a direct way of determining the Schwinger term is by normal-ordering bilinear expressions. The field and the canonical momentum are expanded in energy eigenmodes $e^{\pm i\omega t}$. For positively signed, conventional expressions one calls the coefficient of the positive frequency mode ($e^{-i\omega t}$) the annihilation operator, and 'normal ordering' means putting all annihilation operators to the right of their Hermitian conjugates – the creation operators. This ensures that all states have positive norm and that the spatial integral of the quadratic expression for energy is nonnegative. Moreover, carrying out the calculation of the relevant commutator (which requires normal reordering) exposes a *positive* Schwinger term. In this way, for conventional, positively signed fields (matter and the 'r^1' gravity fields) one gets $c^{\text{matter}} = c_1 = 1$. For negative-signed fields (like the gravitational 'r^0') it is not possible to maintain positivity of *both* the norm and the energy. If positive norm is required – this is appropriate in a Schrödinger representation, where norms are given by manifestly positive (functional) integrals – one must identify the coefficient of the *positive* frequency mode with the *creation* operator (*viz.*, in a manner opposite to what was done above). This has the consequence that the negatively signed 'energy-like' expression is negative. But in our gravitational application, this quantity does not correspond to a physical energy, and its value is immaterial. When this convention is used in the normal ordering calculation of the Schwinger term, one finds a negative quantity, $c_0 = -1$. Alternatively, one may use the coefficient of the positive frequency mode as the annihilation operator (*viz.*, in a manner identical to the treatment of conventional, positively signed expressions). Then the 'energy integral' is positive, but negative norm states are present. This is the choice taken string theory. When the normal ordering calculation is carried out, one finds a positive center, $c_0 = 1$, just as for positively signed quadratic expressions. We shall make use, in turn, of both alternatives. (The above-described variety is analogous to what is seen in Gupta-Bleuler quantization of electrodynamics: the time component potential A_0 enters with negative quadratic term. Quantization is conventionally carried out so that negative norm states arise, but the energy is positive; this is preferred on physical grounds. But one could choose, alternatively, to maintain positive norm, and allow the unphysical time-like 'photons' to carry negative energy.)

In the Schrödinger representation quantum field theory approach, one maintains positive norm states in a Hilbert space, and finds $c_0 = -1$, $c^{\text{gravity}} = c_0 + c_1 = 0$, $c = c^{\text{gravity}} + c^{\text{matter}} = 1$. Thus pure gravity has no obstructions, only matter provides the obstruction. Consequently the constraints of pure gravity can be solved, indeed explicit formulas have been gotten by many people [9]. (This shows *a posteriori* that there can be no obstruction.) In our formalism, according to (21)–(26) the constraints read

$$\mathcal{E}^{\text{gravity}}\,|\psi\rangle_{\text{gravity}} \sim \tfrac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{1}{\Lambda}\frac{\delta^2}{\delta r^a \delta r_a} - \Lambda r^{a\prime} r_a{}'\Big)\Psi_{\text{gravity}}(r^a) = 0 \tag{37}$$

$$\mathcal{P}^{\text{gravity}}\,|\psi\rangle_{\text{gravity}} \sim i r^{a\prime}\frac{\delta}{\delta r^a}\Psi_{\text{gravity}}(r^a) = 0 \tag{38}$$

with two solutions

$$\Psi_{\rm gravity}(r^a) = \exp \pm i\frac{\Lambda}{2}\int {\rm d}\sigma\, \epsilon_{ab} r^a r^{b\prime} \quad . \tag{39}$$

This may also be presented by an action of a definite operator on the Fock vacuum state $|0\rangle$,

$$\Psi_{\rm gravity}(r^a) \propto \left[\exp \pm \int {\rm d}k\, a_0{}^\dagger(k)\, \epsilon(k)\, a_1{}^\dagger(-k)\right] |0\rangle \tag{40}$$

with $a_a{}^\dagger(k)$ creating field oscillations of definite momentum:

$$a_a{}^\dagger(k) = \frac{-i}{\sqrt{4\pi\Lambda|k|}}\int {\rm d}\sigma\, e^{ik\sigma}\, \pi_a(\sigma) + \sqrt{\frac{\Lambda|k|}{4\pi}}\int {\rm d}\sigma\, e^{ik\sigma}\, r^a(\sigma) \quad . \tag{41}$$

As expected, the state functional is invariant against spatial coordinate redefinition, $\sigma \to \tilde\sigma(\sigma)$; this is best seen by recognizing that the integrand in the exponent of (39) is a 1-form: $d\sigma\, \epsilon_{ab}\, r^a\, r^{b\prime} = \epsilon_{ab}\, r^a\, dr^b$.

Although this state is here presented for a gravity model in the Schrödinger representation field theory context, it is also of interest to practitioners of conformal field theory and string theory. The algebra (31)–(33), especially when written in decoupled form,

$$\Theta_\pm = \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathcal{E} \mp P) \tag{42}$$

$$[\Theta_\pm(\sigma), \Theta_\pm(\tilde\sigma)] = \pm i\,(\Theta_\pm(\sigma) + \Theta_\pm(\tilde\sigma))\,\delta'(\sigma - \tilde\sigma) \mp \frac{ic}{24\pi}\delta'''(\sigma - \tilde\sigma) \tag{43}$$

$$[\Theta_\pm(\sigma), \Theta_\mp(\tilde\sigma)] = 0 \tag{44}$$

is recognized as the position-space version of the Virasoro algebra and the Schwinger term is just the Virasoro anomaly. Usually one does not find a field-theoretic, nonghost realization *without* the Virasoro center; yet the CGHS model, without matter, provides an explicit example. Usually one does not expect that *all* the Virasoro generators annihilate a state, but in fact our states (39)–(40) enjoy that property. Indeed, one frequently hears in string theory discussions that "the Virasoro anomaly is insensitive to the target space metric," *i.e.*, contributions from positive-signed quadratic expressions give the same anomaly as the negative-signed ones. But our analysis shows that the above statement is not absolute; other possibilities exist [8]!

Once matter is added, a center appears, $c = 1$, and the theory becomes anomalous. In the same Schrödinger representation approach used above, one strategy is the following modification of a method used by Kuchař in another context [7,10]. The Lagrange density (18) is presented in terms of decoupled constraints (42):

$$\mathcal{L} = \pi_a \dot r^a + \Pi\dot\varphi - \lambda^+\Theta_+ - \lambda^-\Theta_- \tag{45}$$

$$\lambda^\pm = \alpha \pm \beta \tag{46}$$

Then the gravity variables $\{\pi_a, r^a\}$ are transformed by a linear canonical transformation to a new set $\{P_\pm, X^\pm\}$, in terms of which (45) reads

$$\mathcal{L} = P_+\dot X^+ + P_-\dot X^- + \Pi\dot\varphi - \lambda^+\left(P_+X^{+\prime} + \theta_+^{\rm matter}\right) - \lambda^-\left(-P_-X^{-\prime} + \theta_-^{\rm matter}\right) \tag{47}$$

$$\theta_\pm^{\rm matter} = \tfrac{1}{4}(\Pi \pm \varphi')^2 \tag{48}$$

The gravity portions of the constraints $\Theta_\pm$ have been transformed to $\pm P_\pm X^{\pm\prime}$ – expressions that look like momentum densities for fields $X^\pm$, and thus satisfy the $\Theta_\pm$ algebra (43)–(44) without center, as do also momentum densities; see (12).

The entire obstruction in the full gravity plus matter constraints comes from the commutator of the matter contributions $\theta_\pm^{\rm matter}$. In order to remove the obstruction, we modify the theory by adding $\Delta\Theta_\pm$ to the constraint $\Theta_\pm$, such that no center arises in the modified constraints. An expression for $\Delta\Theta_\pm$ that does the job is

$$\Delta\Theta_\pm = \frac{1}{48\pi}(\ln X^{\pm\prime})'' \quad . \tag{49}$$

Hence $\tilde\Theta_\pm \equiv \Theta_\pm + \Delta\Theta_\pm$ possess no obstruction in their algebra, and can annihilate states. Explicitly, the modified constraint equations read in the Schrödinger representation (after dividing by $X^{\pm\prime}$)

$$\left(\frac{1}{i}\frac{\delta}{\delta X^\pm} \pm \frac{1}{48\pi X^{\pm\prime}}\big(\ln X^{\pm\prime}\big)'' \pm \frac{1}{X^{\pm\prime}}\theta_\pm^{\rm matter}\right)\psi(X^\pm,\varphi) = 0 \quad . \tag{50}$$

It is recognized that the anomaly has been removed by introducing functional $U(1)$ connections in $X^\pm$ space, whose curvature cancels the anomaly. In the modified constraint there still is no mixing between gravitational variables $\{P_\pm, X^\pm\}$ and matter variables $\{\Pi,\varphi\}$. But the modified gravitational contribution is no longer quadratic – indeed it is nonpolynomial. Nevertheless, it is possible to analyze the consequences of (50), by the methods that Kuchař used to solve a physically different, but formally similar, problem [10]. He presented his research at this conference, and his analysis, which is also published [11], confirms ours [7]. The resulting state space describes in a diffeomorphism-invariant fashion the propagation of a massless free particle on flat space. This result follows closely what one would infer from a consideration of the dynamics (18)–(20) within classical physics.

In the BRST quantization method, extensively employed by string and conformal field theory investigators, one adds ghosts, which carry their own anomaly of $c_{\rm ghost} = -26$. Also one improves $\Theta_\pm$ by the addition of $\Delta\Theta_\pm$ so that c is increased; for example, with

$$\Delta\Theta_\pm = \frac{Q}{\sqrt{4\pi}}\,(\Pi \pm \varphi')' \tag{51}$$

$$c \to c + 3Q^2 \quad . \tag{52}$$

[The modification (51) corresponds to 'improving' the energy momentum tensor by $(\partial_\mu\partial_\nu - g_{\mu\nu}\Box)\varphi$.] The 'background charge' Q is chosen so that the total anomaly vanishes:

$$c + 3Q^2 + c_{\rm ghost} = c + 3Q^2 - 26 = 0 \quad . \tag{53}$$

Moreover, the constraints are relaxed by imposing that physical states are annihilated by the 'BRST' charges, rather than by the bosonic constraints. This is roughly equivalent to enforcing 'half' the bosonic constraints, the positive frequency portions. In this way one arrives at a rich and well-known spectrum.

Within BRST quantization, the negative-signed gravitational field r^0 is quantized so that negative norm states arise – just as in Gupta–Bleuler electrodynamics. [Negative norm states cannot arise in a Schrödinger representation, where the inner product is explicitly given by a (functional) integral, leading to positive norm.] One then finds $c_0 = 1$; the center is insensitive to the signature with which fields enter the action. As a consequence, $c^{\rm gravity} = c_0 + c_1 = 2$ so that even pure gravity constraints possess an obstruction.

Evidently, pure gravity with $c^{\rm gravity} = 2$ requires $Q = 2\sqrt{2}$. The resulting BRST spectrum is different from the states (39)–(40) found in the Schrödinger representation.

Gravity with matter carries $c = 3$, and becomes quantizable at $Q = \sqrt{23/3}$. A rich spectrum emerges, with more states than in the Schrödinger approach, but with no apparent relation to a particle spectrum.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Without question, the CGHS model, and other similar two-dimensional gravity models, are afflicted by anomalies in their constraint algebras, which become second-class and frustrate straightforward quantization. While anomalies can be calculated and are finite, their specific value depends on the way singularities of quantum field theory are resolved, and this leads to a variety of procedures for overcoming the problem and to a variety of quantum field theories, with quite different properties.

Two methods were discussed: (i) a Schrödinger representation with Kuchař-type improvement as needed, *i.e.*, when matter is present, and (ii) BRST quantization. (Actually several other approaches are also available [12].) Only in the first method, with positive norm states and vanishing anomaly, does the quantum theory bear a resemblance to the classical theory, in that the classical picture of physics is reflected within the quantum theory. On the other hand, the string theory/BRST approach yields spectra that seem quite different from what one would expect on the basis of the classical theory.

Presumably, if anomalies were absent, the different quantization procedures (Schrödinger representation, BRST, ...) would produce the same physics. However, the anomalies *are* present and interfere with equivalence.

Finally, I remark that our investigation has exposed an interesting structure within Virasoro theory: there exists a field-theoretic realization of the algebra without the anomaly, in terms of spinless fields and with no ghost fields. Moreover, there are states that are annihilated by *all* the Virasoro generators.

What does any of this teach us about the physical four-dimensional model? I believe that an extension in the constraint algebra will arise for all physical, propagating degrees of freedom: for matter fields, as is seen already in two dimensions, and also for gravity fields, which in four dimensions (unlike in two) carry physical energy. How to overcome this higher-dimensional obstruction to quantization is unclear. Especially problematic is the fact that flat-space calculations of anomalous Schwinger terms in four dimensions yield infinite results, essentially for dimensional reasons. Therefore, any announced 'solutions' to the constraints that result from *formal* analysis must be viewed as preliminary: properties of the Hilbert space and of the inner product must be fixed first in order to give an unambiguous determination of any obstructions.

I believe that our two-dimensional investigation, although in a much simpler and unphysical setting, nevertheless contains important clues for realistic theories. Certainly that was the lesson of vector gauge theories: anomalies and vacuum angle have corresponding roles in the Schwinger model and in QCD!

[1] See R. Jackiw, in *Quantum Mechanics of Fundamental Systems*, C. Teitelboim, ed. (Plenum, New York NY, 1988).
[2] D. Boulware and S. Deser, *J. Math. Phys* **8**, 1468 (1967).
[3] R. Jackiw and C. Teitelboim, in *Quantum Theory of Gravity*, S. Christensen, ed. (A. Hilger, Bristol UK, 1984).
[4] D. Cangemi, *Phys. Lett.* **B297**, 261 (1992); A. Achúcarro, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1037 (1993).
[5] A. Polyakov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A2**, 893 (1987), *Gauge Fields and Strings* (Harwood, New York NY, 1987).
[6] C. Callan, S. Giddings, J. Harvey, and A. Strominger, *Phys. Rev. D* **45** 1005 (1992); H. Verlinde in *Sixth Marcel Grossmann Meeting on General Relativity*, M. Sato and T. Nakamura, eds. (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992).
[7] Our two most recent papers on this entire subject, with reference to earlier work, are D. Cangemi, R. Jackiw, and B. Zwiebach, *Ann. Phys.* (NY) **245**, 408 (1996); E. Benedict, R. Jackiw, and H.-J. Lee, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 6213 (1996).
[8] P. Jordan, *Z. Phys.* **93**, 464 (1935). In the context of the energy-momentum tensor commutator anomaly, this is explained in R. Floreanini and R. Jackiw, *Phys. Lett.* **B175**, 428 (1986).
[9] D. Cangemi and R. Jackiw, *Phys. Lett.* **B337**, 271 (1994), *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 3913 (1994); D. Amati, S. Elitzur, and E. Rabinovici, *Nucl. Phys.* **B418**, 45 (1994); D. Louis-Martinez, J. Gegenberg, and G. Kunstatter, *Phys. Lett.* **B321**, 193 (1994); E. Benedict, *Phys. Lett.* **B340**, 43 (1994); T. Strobl, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 7346 (1994); Ref. [7].
[10] K. Kuchař, *Phys. Rev. D* **39**, 2263 (1989); K. Kuchař and G. Torre, *J. Math. Phys.* **30**, 1769 (1989).
[11] K. Kuchař, J. Romano, and M. Varadarjan, *Phys. Rev. D* **55**, xxxx (1997).
[12] Cangemi, Jackiw, and Zwiebach, Ref. [7]